



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MARCH MEETING, 1893.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 9th instant, at three o'clock, P. M. ; the President, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS, in the chair.

The record of the last meeting was read and approved ; and the Librarian read his list of donors to the Library.

The PRESIDENT then said : —

For a third time at our succeeding monthly meetings we have to recognize the loss by death of members from our roll ; and now it is of two honored and useful associates who had filled their fourscore of years, — Rev. Robert C. Waterston and Dr. Henry Wheatland. For many recent years we have missed their presence at our meetings ; Mr. Waterston having been in retirement under painful physical infirmities, Dr. Wheatland's time and interest being engrossed by his devoted zeal in many other societies with objects kindred to our own.

Our older members can hardly fail to associate Mr. Waterston here with his brother-in-law, Dr. Charles Deane, so honored and cherished by us, to whose removal from us we have hardly as yet become reconciled. Starting their career in mercantile life as contemporaries, brought into close friendly and domestic relations, they may have mutually influenced each other in the direction of their tastes and interests in objects which brought them into membership and engaged their zeal in this Society.

Mr. Waterston, born to a favored lot, while yet a clerk, was a fond collector and reader of books, and keenly engaged in the cultivation of his artistic tastes, in which by time and later travel abroad he acquired accomplishments. He had also strong impulses to benevolent activity and philanthropy. It was while doing effective services in these fields that he was prompted to prepare himself for the Christian ministry, in which he was engaged with devotion and fidelity for many years.

He came into membership here in 1859, and did much intelligent and kindly work in the service of the Society, enriching it with donations and acting on its committees. His gifts to us were largely of autographs, portraits, and relics of men of fame and of historical objects. He wrote for the Proceedings memoirs of our associates, George Sumner and George B. Emerson, and paid tributes here to the poets Sprague and Bryant, to William G. Brooks, President Quincy, and Motley.

There are some here who will recall the delightful evening when we shared the hospitalities of his home in commemorating the centennial of the Boston Tea Party, December 16, 1873. The account of that meeting, with many documents, in our Proceedings, is an instructive historical narrative. In our Proceedings also will be found an interesting letter which Mr. Waterston addressed to the Society in 1870 from San Francisco, whither he had gone with the Board of Trade. In another piece from his pen, he makes the old elm on the Common the relator and commentator on what has transpired for centuries on this peninsula. Mr. Waterston was an active member of the Natural History Society and other associations, and gave much time and labor to the city on the School Committee.

Dr. Henry Wheatland was elected to membership in 1847. He identified the principal work and interests of his long life mainly with institutions in Salem devoted to the preservation and illustration of the historical relics of that, the first of the permanent settlements in the Bay Colony. Those relics in objects and documents are rich and copious, covering, indeed, in a well-nigh complete and exhaustive collection long under his charge as the head of the Essex Institute, the antiquities and memorials accumulating for nearly three centuries.

They begin with the reconstructed rafters and timbers of the first meeting-house of the settlement, in which Higginson, Hugh Peters, and Roger Williams preached and Governor Winthrop exhorted and "prophesied." In no other ancient town in our country, not even in the Pilgrim Hall at Plymouth, is there gathered so full and continuous a collection of articles identified with the life of the succeeding generations of the people. The household, domestic, culinary, mechanical, and agricultural implements of the elders are all represented.

Their apparel and furniture, as well as their effigies, journals, letters, and books, present themselves in order. It was largely through Dr. Wheatland's zeal and care that two earlier organizations in Salem, the Essex County Natural History Society and the Essex Historical Society, were united to form the Essex Institute in 1848, from which date Dr. Wheatland has been its head and its indefatigable servant.

He had previously been the superintendent of another unique and characteristic institution of Salem, the Museum of the East India Marine Society. That museum, with its curious gathering of objects from all seas and lands, is a striking memorial of the once world-wide commerce of Salem, all its contents having been picked up and transported by Salem shipmasters in the ships of Salem's old merchant princes.

Dr. Wheatland was also a trustee of the Peabody Academy of Science, and of the Peabody Museum of American Archæology and Ethnology. Our Society is indebted to him for many valuable donations, and for memoirs of our associates, Dr. Benjamin Merrill and Benjamin R. Nichols.

Mr. Josiah P. Quincy was appointed to write a memoir of Mr. Waterston, and Mr. William P. Upham a memoir of Dr. Wheatland, for publication in the Proceedings of the Society.

The President presented from Mrs. Henry V. Poor, a daughter of the late Rev. Dr. John Pierce, a manuscript volume in her father's handwriting, containing transcripts of ten addresses to which he had listened when a young man, and some of which, it is believed, have not been printed.

It was voted that the thanks of the Society for her valuable gift should be communicated to Mrs. Poor by the Secretary, and that the volume should be placed with the manuscript diary given by Rev. Dr. Pierce.

Mr. WILLIAM S. APPLETON, of the first section, read the following communication:—

Hugh Peter in Literature.

Hugh Peter figures largely in literature. He was the author of several small works; he has of course an important place in every one of the oft-reprinted accounts of the Trials of the Regicides; his own life has been written several times;

and he is the principal character, or is incidentally introduced, in various other volumes.

Of his own works the best known is the "Dying Father's Last Legacy to an Only Child : or Mr. Hugh Peter's Advice to his Daughter," published soon after his death, and reprinted at Boston in 1717. It shows his best and tenderest side ; but the advice is indeed solemn and heavy. The only other of his works which I shall notice is the "Good Work for a Good Magistrate. or, A short Cut to great quiet. by Honest, homely plain English Hints given from Scripture, Reason, and Experience, for the regulating of most Cases in this Commonwealth. Concerning *Religion ; Mercie ; Justice*," published at London in 1651. It is a remarkable book ; and if really and wholly by Peter, shows what a many-sided man he was, with some ideas far in advance of his time. In the introduction and in a dedicatory letter to his "dear friend J. T." he intimates, however, that this friend had some share in the work. It treats of, I. the Advancement of Religion ; II. Mercie to the poor ; III. Justice, with supplementary chapters on the Advancement of Learning, the Improvement of Nature, the Incouragement of Arts and Manufactures, and the Inceas of Merchandise, with a postscript Concerning Printing. I wish to call attention to a few of its most striking paragraphs.

Under "Mercie to the poor" he urges the establishment in every town of a "*Lombard* (or bank of lending), . . . where the poor, that have no friends, or will not make their need known, and such as on a sudden are fallen into som strait, may have money upon their paune upon a reasonable Interest ; *A Lombard* well regulated, would bee a worke of much mercie ; and the monies of orphans might bee imploied in this waie to maintein the fatherless, and increas their stock, so would good bee don both waies." Surely in later times we have something very like this, whether known as a "Mont de Piété," "Institution for Savings," or otherwise. Justice is by far the longest division of the book. In it Peter urges the establishment of Registries of Deeds, the abolishment of Entail, the punishment of thieves by sending them to two Gallies "to row from *Gravesend* to *Queenborow*," "That it bee inacted through the Nation, that none drink to another, directly, or indirectly, upon the forfeiture of twelve pence, whereof six pence to the informer, and six pence to the poor ;

which, though it seem ridiculous, will prove the likeliest waie of prevention ; the practice beeing of men ingrammatical, and practised in no Countries, but among our neighbors in *Germanie*, &c."

One would hardly expect to find Hugh Peter writing of the "Improvement of Nature" and the "Incouragement of Arts and Manufactures"; but we certainly do. Under the former he proposes the "*cutting of Rivers*, where none are, and making them deeper that are too shallow," thus anticipating a River and Harbor bill as atrocious as any the American Congress ever passed. Under the latter he would liberally reward inventors, and would "suffer all Commodities, from all parts of the world to bee brought in free without Custom."

Under the "Increas of Merchandise" he would "have special care to keep the Soveraintie of the Sea," and gives space to his ideas for the reformation of the English Navy, in which "the offer of New-England may bee entertained, who tender the building of what Ships, or Frigats are desired, and to bring them into the Thames, and there their value impartially judg'd; who likewise may furnish iron guns, masts, &c."; he also would "take of all incumbrance from Merchandise, as Custom, Excise, Pasports, &c.," in this anticipating one reform of very recent date and another which this country has not yet reached. He gives at length his ideas on Money and Banking, and then, writing not of Paris but of London, anticipates Baron Haussmann as follows:—

"That Thames-street, for a mile or two long, bee made as broad, or broader than anie street in *London*; . . . The difficultie seem's to bee in pulling down, and new building of houses, or removing them on screws, as at *Amsterdam*: But things may bee so ordered, as the profit to bee made, by convenient building; and the value, houses, and ground will bee at, by bettering the street and the Key, will fully countervail the charge of all this whole work."

Dirty streets next have his attention; and then "All wooden houses in *London* must down; . . . and no new houses to bee built, but with brick or stone, to prevent fire."

In the "Postscript Concerning Printing" he would have a proper copyright law, and "That no Books printed originally in England, may bee imported from beyond Seas into this Commonwealth: other States will not suffer it: and wee finde

by experience that neither Autor, nor Printer, nor bookseller can bee encouraged, when the Book, assoon as it is out here, shall bee printed beyond Sea, when they have paper and printing at a cheaper rate, and hither imported, oftentimes to the ruine of the undertakers of a good work here." I did not intend to say so much about this volume, but the more I studied it, the more interesting I found it.

The Life of Hugh Peter has been written several times, even so lately as 1851 by our associate, the late Rev. Joseph B. Felt. I will only mention the Life of 1663 by that black-guard Dr. William Yonge, and that of 1751, "After the Manner of Mr. Bayle." But the Rev. Samuel Peters, LL.D. of Connecticut wrote "A History of the Rev. Hugh Peters, A.M.," published in 1807, which is certainly a literary curiosity, if there be any such. I await with a decided feeling of eagerness and interest the memoir which shall appear in the new English "Dictionary of National Biography"; and I hope it will be written by an impartial person, who will judge Peter not alone from the words of his avowed enemies and detractors, but also from his own writings, including the letters printed by this Society in the Winthrop Papers.

My principal object in beginning this was to notice the various works in which Hugh Peter figures either principally or incidentally. There is the "Tales and Jests of Mr. Hugh Peters," printed in 1660, and reprinted in 1807. I can find not much fun in the book, and probably as little truth. There is "Peters Patern," a pretended Funeral Sermon after the false report of his death in 1659, and "Hugh Peters's Dreame," both dreary attempts at wit. There is a play "The Famous Tragedie of King Charles I." of 1649, in which Peter is presented as the pimp and pander of Cromwell, who calls him "my fine facetious Devill," "my deare Buffone," etc. The Rev. Thomas Edwards devotes to Hugh Peter more than twenty-five pages of the "Gangræna," and quotes him as authority for the statement that near New England was an island twenty miles long and three miles broad, "which was so full of pigeons, that the Island was all covered over with pigeons dung two foot deep." I am in doubt whether to consider this a proof of Peter's powers of observation or of exaggeration.

My intention, however, was to quote only references to Peter

of a comic or serio-comic character. In the "EPULÆ THYESTÆ: OR, The THANKSGIVING-DINNER: WHERE The Devill finds all, Meat, Cooks, Guests, &c. TOGETHER WITH THE CITY PRESENT. 'ALSO A Short GRACE after a Long Dinner. AND A GOD-SPEED," printed at London in 1648, we read, —

"There *Peters*, the *Denyer* (nay, 'tis said
He, that (Disguis'd) *Cut off his Masters Head*)
That Godly Pidgeon of Apostacy,
Does buzze about his Anti-Monarchy:
His Scaffold-Doctrines; and such murdering stuffe,
Which yet Wounds nought but the affrighted Ruffe
Of the Laps'd *Aldermen*."

In "PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD. *Libri Theologici, Politici, Historici, Nundinis Paulinis (una cum Templo) prostant venales. Juxta seriem Alphabeti Democratici*. Done into English for the Assembly of Divines." Number 1 is "*Guzman's Cases of Conscience*; Revised and augmented by *Hugh Peters*"; Number 132 is "An Act for repealing a former Act [called *An Act disabling Clergy-men to intermeddle in civill Affairs*] that so Mr. *Peters* may be of the *Committee for altering the Law*"; and Number 175 is "Whether Master *Peters* did justly preach against Christmas Pyes the same day he eate two Mince-pies to his dinner?" In "THE Assembly-man," printed 1662-3, but said to be "*Written in the Year 1647*," we read "His sole comfort is, he can-not out-sin *Hugh Peters*: Sure, as Satan hath possessed the *Assembler*, so *Hugh Peters* hath possessed Satan, and is the Devil's Devil. He alone would fill a whole Herd of *Gadarens*." In "The Posthumous Works of Mr. Samuel Butler, Author of *Hudibras*," is "*Hugh Peters's Thanksgiving Speech for a Farewel to the City, in the behalf of the General and Lieutenant-General*," too long to quote here.

Peter is introduced of late years in Praed's ballad "Marston Moor," a worthy mate to Macaulay's Naseby. After the total defeat of the Royalists in the battle, Sir Nicholas, returning on foot to his home, says to his wife, the Lady Alice, —

"Sweet! we will fill our money-bags, and freight a ship for France,
And mourn in merry Paris for this poor land's mischance:
For if the worst befall me, why, better axe and rope,
Than life with Lenthal for a king, and Peters for a pope!
Alas! alas! my gallant Guy! — curse on the crop-eared boor
Who sent me with my standard on foot from Marston Moor!"

Hon. MELLEN CHAMBERLAIN spoke in substance as follows :

At the October meeting of our Society, I briefly adverted to the Talcott Papers, then recently laid upon our table, and expressed a purpose of giving them a more careful reading. This I have done, and now present some of the results.

They form volume four of the Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society, with this titlepage: "The Talcott Papers, Correspondence, and Documents (chiefly official) during Joseph Talcott's Governorship of the Colony of Connecticut, 1724-41. Edited by Mary Kingsbury Talcott. Volume I. 1724-36."

These papers cover a period of Connecticut history hitherto regarded as lacking interest ; but now, by reason of the light thrown upon the constitutional relations of that colony to the Crown and Parliament, this history becomes important. They also supplement and make more intelligible the case of *Winthrop vs. Lechmere* in the sixth volume, sixth series, of our own Collections ; and the form in which they are presented revives a question raised many years ago by Dr. Palfrey as to the classification of the State Archives.

Governor Talcott appears to have been assiduous and methodical in his conduct of public affairs, and careful to preserve the documentary evidence of those transactions in which he participated ; for in this volume we find not only letters and documents, but also, in many instances, the answers and counter documents. These the editor has arranged in chronological order, and with commendable diligence has filled from other sources some gaps in the Governor's files, and added succinct biographical and explanatory notes. In this way the reader has before him, in exact sequence as it was forming, and in its most authentic character, a large part of the public history of Connecticut, from October 5, 1724, to November 30, 1736, with promise of another volume which will bring it down to 1741.

Apart from the remarkable journey of Hooker and his party, with their herds of cattle, through the wilderness to the valley of the Connecticut, in the summer of 1636, and the extermination of the Pequots the next year, the history of that colony hardly excites popular interest. Protected by her position from Indian incursions, her annals afford no tales

of massacres, or of burning houses so common elsewhere in New England. She banished no Antinomians ; she hanged no Quakers, nor is her history saddened by the witchcraft delusion of 1692. Her development centres around no romantic personality like Roger Williams, nor was it guided by the calm statesmanship of the elder Winthrop.

Here was a colony remarkable neither for the fertility of its soil, nor the extent of its domains. It had little timber, and produced no staple. None of its harbors attracted the commerce of Europe, and its people were too remote from the larger fisheries for profitable participation in them.

Doubtless this isolation was not without compensations ; for if the people did not share the wealth of European trade, neither did they suffer from the deteriorating influences which accompanied it. No circumstance of their condition attracted undesirable immigrants ; and so this people, mainly agriculturists, homogeneous in race and ecclesiastical predilections, were free to work out the problem of self-government. No people are more happy than those who have no other history.

The marvel is how it came to pass that this little community of farmers, small tradesmen, and mechanics, remote from the centres of civilization and having little to do with European thought, so managed their affairs and wrought for self-culture, that at the outbreak of the Revolution it brought to the front, in the person of her Governor, Jonathan Trumbull, an unequalled administrator of public affairs in New England ; sent to the wars one of its ablest generals ; was ably represented in the Continental Congress, and in the Convention of 1787 by that unsurpassed triumvirate of constitutionalists, Sherman, Johnson, and Ellsworth ; and before the close of the century became distinguished for her theologians, jurists, poets, and men of letters. We have something more to learn about this history.

Two periods in Connecticut history had much to do with the phenomena I have mentioned, especially in respect to her progress in constitutional government. One of these, well known, has made her famous among the thirteen colonies ; and the other, to me at least very little known, is the administration of Governor Talcott, of which I propose to say something. But first, a word about the earlier period.

When Massachusetts writers—assuming with characteristic

assurance her pre-eminence among the colonies for intelligence, character, and conduct of affairs — account for it by quoting old William Stoughton that “God sifted a whole nation that he might send choice grain over into the wilderness,” Connecticut writers are swift to add that the simpler, more democratic, and more rational life of her people was due to the *twice-sifted seed* with which she was planted.

And that certainly was a very select and admirable body of men who, under the lead of Hooker and Stone, Haynes and Ludlow, settled the upper Connecticut valley in 1636–37, and formed the Constitution of 1639, whether agreeably to an antecedent purpose brought from Holland by Hooker, or as an expression of what was not only desirable in their situation, but also practicable to a people unhampered by the restrictive conditions of a charter, or by any potential jurisdiction of the Crown. But whatever may have been the origin or vitality of these primitive principles and conduct, there came a time when, under changed conditions, neither the civil nor the ecclesiastical autonomy of Connecticut essentially differed — certainly not for the better — from that of the parent colony.

Nevertheless, an interval passed over, Connecticut again came to the front among the leading colonies which carried on the War of the Revolution, and was second to none in framing the new constitution, and in setting in operation the government under it.

The Talcott Papers throw light upon the causes which led to this state of facts; and to these I now turn.

At the outbreak of the Revolution, though the exigencies of their situation forced the colonists to question their relations to parliamentary authority, they affirmed even with vehemence that they were “dutiful subjects to the best of kings.”

But fifty years before this, their trials — peculiar in kind, degree, and pervasiveness — must have led the people of Connecticut gravely to consider the power both of the Crown and of Parliament over them; and in the history of these events as set forth by the Talcott Papers, is to be found an interesting chapter of their progress in constitutional affairs, new to me, and it may be to others.

These questions arose in one form in the case of Winthrop *vs.* Lechmere, which, though filling a large space in the latest

volume of our Collections, is seen in its completeness only when supplemented by the Talcott Papers. A mere outline of the case will serve to bring the subject before us. Wait Winthrop, son of Gov. John Winthrop of Connecticut, died in 1717, leaving two children, — John Winthrop, the plaintiff, and Ann, wife of Thomas Lechmere, the defendant. His landed estates in Connecticut were large, and their descent was regulated by the law of that colony, which divided the property of an intestate among his children; giving, however, a double portion to the eldest son. By this rule John Winthrop would be entitled to two thirds of the estate, and his sister to one third. Dissatisfied with this division, he claimed the whole of the realty (as by the law of England he would be entitled), on the ground that the colony law above referred to was invalid, being in contravention of the charter of King Charles, in 1662, which by implication forbade the making of any law "contrary to the laws of this realm of England." This, however, was not the view taken by Thomas Lechmere and his wife; and in 1724 they began proceedings to recover one third of the real estate. These proceedings before different courts in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and England, terminated in a decree of the king in Council, February 15, 1728, which declared the Connecticut law void, reversed the judgments of her courts, and gave the whole of the real estate to John Winthrop.

The appalling effect of this decree can be easily understood. In general, litigation concerns only the parties to it, and those immediately connected with them; but in this case the decree of the king affected every person, old or young, male or female, in Connecticut; and even the child unborn might rue the ruling of that day. It reversed the policy of distribution and settlement of estates which, either by practice or positive law, had prevailed in Connecticut from the beginning, and must have been very alarming to the other New England colonies in which a similar usage prevailed. It unsettled the foundations of property, and threatened universal litigation in families.

Many of the grievances which the colonies complained of at a later day were merely theoretical, such as an assertion of authority over them by the Crown or Parliament, or a prospective tax which was neither paid nor levied, and therefore not intolerable. But the decree of the king in the case

of Winthrop *vs.* Lechmere, *ipso facto*, threw all rights in real estate into a confusion from which immediate and dire distress followed.

In this alarming exigency the first question was as to the likelihood of relief by a reversal of the king's decree as matter of law; and if not, then whether the king, as successor to Charles II., who granted their charter, by a supplementary charter could and would abscind that clause which forbade their passing any law contrary to the laws of England; and if this lay outside his power or will, then could and would Parliament do so?

On the one hand, it was doubtful if the king could absolve any of his subjects from their express obligations to the laws of the realm, even though, had Charles II. so chosen, he might have omitted the restrictive clause; and on the other hand, it was questionable whether Parliament had power to regulate the disposition of lands the title to which, as well as the power to govern their inhabitants, was derived exclusively from the Crown, in which, by the public law of Europe, they vested on their discovery by English subjects.

Of the king's property in lands so discovered, or of his prerogative in governing them, there had been no accepted doubt; though in Coke's time his right to grant monopolies — such, for example, as the exclusive right to fish in American waters, with the sole use of adjacent lands for curing the catch — had been questioned with some effect.

These questions were in abeyance during the interregnum which ensued on the death of Charles I., when the prerogatives were engrossed by the parliamentary government. But on the restoration, Charles II. resumed the old prerogatives of the Crown, and in 1662 granted to Connecticut a charter with powers of government little short of absolute and independent.

And so the case stood at the time of the decision of Winthrop *vs.* Lechmere. The king's title to ungranted colonial lands was good; but was it personal and absolute, or, like his other prerogatives, in trust for the common welfare of his subjects? Without doubt he, and he alone, could erect colonial governments, appoint their officers, and allow or disallow their laws; but then, again, were these prerogatives absolute, or subject to some sort of parliamentary regulation? The power and its limitations are best seen in examples. In

1691, William and Mary granted the second charter of Massachusetts, in which they prescribed its constitution, its legislative and judicial powers, and reserved to themselves the appointment of certain officers. Here was a clear and unquestioned exercise of the royal prerogative; but in 1725 the Privy Council, which apart from the king had nothing to do with the matter, forced an explanatory charter upon Massachusetts, with threats that in case she rejected it, *Parliament would take the case in hand*. This was the first effective entrance of that wedge which in 1776 split the empire, — Parliament, by the passage of the Boston Port Bill, having assumed the prerogative of the Crown.¹

In this unsettled state of the royal prerogatives, Connecticut might well doubt whether to seek relief from the king or from the Parliament; but, as we shall see a little later, she could safely apply to neither. For if George II. could amend the charter, by the like exercise of prerogative he could take it away altogether; and if Parliament could make one law affecting the king's prerogative in colonial matters, it could make any law.

Acceptance of either horn of this dilemma might prove fatal; and a clear perception of this brought home to every citizen of Connecticut through their representatives in the General Assembly, which was consulted at every stage of the proceedings, more than any other fact in their history, made them familiar with constitutional questions, and prepared them, in the fulness of time, to reject the authority of both king and Parliament.

It remains to verify these statements by the Talcott Papers.

The case of Winthrop *vs.* Lechmere was a private suit, in which neither the people nor the government of Connecticut had any direct interest; and therefore, when Winthrop appealed from the Superior Court of the colony to the king in Council, the case was argued only by the counsel of the respective parties. Connecticut did not appear by her agent, nor, had she appeared, would she have had any standing of record in court. But neither the restless activity nor the animosity of Winthrop, smarting under real or supposed injuries, permitted him to remain quiet; for during the pen-

¹ Of course these measures received the customary royal assent, for the veto power had been practically given up.

dency of his appeal he exhibited to the king in Council a long and bitter complaint against the government of Connecticut. To make answer to this, Jeremy Dummer, the agent of the colony, resident in London, was summoned in February, 1727; and of this, on the 13th of the same month, he notified Governor Talcott, adding that "if you expect me to manage the cause you must send me at least a hundred Pounds Sterling by the first opportunity. Every hearing will cost me Forty Guineas, and the other side who employ Solicitors and attorneys a great deal more. By the next ship I'll send you a copy of the Complaints." This document is not found among the Talcott Papers; but if we may infer its tenor from the answer, it must have been very alarming.¹

It does not appear, however, that any action was taken by the Connecticut government for more than a year afterward. In the mean time the king in Council had reversed the judgments of the Connecticut courts, and declared null and void the colony statute respecting the settlement of estates, as also an Act which empowered Lechmere, as administrator of the estate of Wait Winthrop, to sell certain of his lands for the payment of his charges.² Before a copy of the decree reached Connecticut in June, news of its import had come by the way of Boston, late in May, 1728; and on the 28th of that month Governor Talcott sent a message to the General Assembly, communicating the intelligence, and recommending that a special agent be sent to London "to espouse our cause before his Majesty in Council."

The General Assembly, appreciating the gravity of the situation, acted at once; and on the 29th Governor Talcott wrote to Jonathan Belcher of Boston, afterward governor of Massachusetts, offering him the agency, to act in concert with Dummer, the resident agent.

Belcher accepted, and, provided with the necessary documents, including his credentials, instructions, arguments, and an address to their Majesties, arrived in London, "after a fine passage of 20 days." April 11, 1729, he wrote to Governor

¹ Though Winthrop's "Complaints" and his "Appeal" are different papers, they appear to have contained some matters in common. The latter, with the brief of counsel, is in 6 Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. v. p. 440 *et seq.*

² This of course invalidated the title of the purchaser, who afterward applied to the General Assembly for relief; and the business occasioned much trouble.

Talcott that he found "Mr. Winthrop [with whom he had had an interview] full of wrath and prejudice against Connecticut, and I believe now endeavoring to do them all the ill offices in his power."

Belcher's instructions form an extraordinary paper, and, if drawn by Talcott, evince him to have been a statesman with clear knowledge of law, a man of ability and great good sense. The document, in fifteen printed pages, covers the whole ground of facts, argument, policy both colonial and British, and constitutional law. No synopsis of the document is practicable within my limits, but a few points may be given: that the policy of dividing real estate among all the children, giving a double portion to the oldest son, is suitable to a new country, where land is cheap and chattels dear, for otherwise the land will remain unoccupied; that large masses of land in a single proprietor are of no value, not being rentable,—for, with an epigram worthy of the best of Poor Richard's, he adds, "if the landlord lives, the tenant starves"; that if the younger sons could not have lands, either they would go where they could find them, thus retarding the population of the colony, or turn to manufacturing,—an argument of much force when addressed to a government which was then making laws against setting up manufactories in the colonies; that all the settlements of estates would be broken up, titles disturbed, suits multiplied, and general confusion ensue; and finally, that the law had received the implied assent of the Crown, and was satisfactory to the people. He then replies *seriatim* to the twenty-nine articles of Winthrop's complaint.

Belcher and Dummer lost no time before getting to their work. On the 20th of May, 1729, the former wrote to Governor Talcott that they had "drawn up the state of the Colony and laid it before the Council, respecting the King's declaration upon your Law for the settling intestate Estates, and considering the King has declared what you call a Law to be null and void, the Charter not giving you power to make such a Law, it is the opinion of the best Council here, upon their most mature deliberation, not to apply to the King in Council, and that for this reason: Inasmuch as there is not power by the Charter you have already, to make such a Law, the King cannot by any after acts ratify that for a law to you, which you had not an original power to make. An order of the King and Council

might indeed look forward and give you such a power, but that would not help or relieve the Colony in the practice they have been in from their first settlement to this time. Beside, upon an application for an order to look forward, they would be ready to say it could be done no otherwayes than by a new Charter, and it would be too dangerous an experiment to resign the present Charter for such an one as would now be given. It is therefore the advice of our Council to bring the matter forward in Parliament in the next Session, and to endeavour to obtain leave to bring in a special bill for the quieting of all Estates, as well for the time past, as to enable the Colony for going on in the same method for the future."

This might have served the purpose of the colony; but on reflection, it was deemed no safer to apply to Parliament for a quieting bill, than to the king for a modification of the charter.

Besides, July 22, Belcher wrote to the Governor that "considering the length of time an application to Parliament would require, as well as the great trouble and charge, it made us very uneasy and desirous (if practicable) to get some relief from the King in Council," notwithstanding the advice of their counsel to the contrary. They therefore waited upon Lord Chancellor King, who after considering the whole case, "kindly told us that our application must be to Parliament, as the safest and most indisputable method to establish the peace and quiet of your people." And so the matter was hung up until the next winter. In the mean time King George II. was about going to Hanover, and members of both houses to the country for diversion.

When Governor Talcott had fully considered the proposed application to Parliament, he wrote to Belcher and Dummer, November 3, 1729, setting forth at great length the reasons for and against application to Parliament as they were laid before the Council at Hartford; and they were of so serious character that the reader feels no surprise that the Governor adds, as his final paragraph, that "if these lines should get into the hands of our enemies, they may possibly be improved to our disadvantage"; and he requests, therefore, that they be kept secret and, without copies being taken, returned by the next good opportunity.

The Governor's fears were very rational: among others,

that an application to the Legislature would "naturally lead the Parliament to inquire whether this government have not accustomed themselves to take the same liberty of making other Laws contrary to the Laws of England, as they themselves are now sensible they have done in this case: on which inquiry it may be feared whether our Ecclesiastical Laws, our establishing a Collegiate School [Yale College], and some of our Civil Laws will not be vacated, as contrary to the Laws of England; and further, whether the Parliament will not on this inquiry fall into an opinion that our Charter has not made us a Government or Province but only a Corporation, and can therefore by the charter make only by-laws."

The Governor's fears anticipated what was very nearly the opinion of Parliament in 1775!

But the complications of Connecticut affairs were not the only source of danger; for at the same time the General Court of Massachusetts was angering the king by doggedly persisting in their long-continued disobedience of his instructions to grant a fixed salary to their governors; and Governor Talcott saw an added danger to Connecticut in "the ill-resented non-compliance of our neighboring province, the Massachusetts, with the King's instructions ordered by way of *threatening into the Parliament*; with which people they know ours are so allied in all their intercourse that their case will bode an ill aspect on ours." And he adds that "the Court and Parliament bear frowning countenances upon the Plantations" on account of the disobedience of the General Court of Massachusetts.

The agents were at loss how to proceed, and shifted their ground as exigencies seemed to demand. February 10, 1730, Belcher wrote Governor Talcott acknowledging the receipt of his reasons for and against an appeal to Parliament, and informed him that upon the advice of counsel, and after the most mature deliberation, the agents had determined to carry the business into Parliament, and accordingly had signed a petition to the king for leave to bring in a bill.¹

¹ This proceeding throws light upon what had come to be the actual relation of Parliament to the Crown colonies. In theory they were still the king's colonies, and he alone could legislate for them; and such remained the theory when the fact was quite otherwise. Nevertheless, in deference to the king's rights, every parliamentary bill in derogation of them was preceded by a petition for leave, as will be more fully explained in the course of this note.

The history of the constitutional relations of the colonies to the king and to

This petition "To the King's most Excell^t Majesty" for leave to bring in a bill recited the facts of the Winthrop-

the Parliament, in their progress to independence of both, is worthy of more attention than it has received, so far as I have noticed; and no less interesting is the connection of this history, as a fact, if not as a cause, with that change in the British Constitution which, beginning with the Revolution of 1688, has substantially transferred the prerogatives of the Crown to the Parliament.

Some facts bearing on the first point found in the Talcott Papers led me to look elsewhere for similar facts, as well as to some reflection on the second point; but my examination has not been exhaustive, nor is my conclusion final. My present purpose will be answered if I succeed in calling attention to what, at least, is an interesting subject for investigation.

It is historical that the colonies, in their disputes about their boundaries or conflicting grants within their own limits, based their respective claims on grants from the king, as paramount lord and rightful owner of the fee of lands discovered under the English flag, and submitted these disputes to his decision; yet in these, as well as in all other matters, when their exigencies required, they sought the intervention of Parliament against the king, as during the Civil Wars; and when they deemed it safe, they practically denied the authority of both. It was so from the beginning; and this history forms part of the history of the American Revolution.

It is also clear that while Parliament recognized the king's property in colonial lands, and his prerogative jurisdiction over their inhabitants, nevertheless, even before the Revolution of 1688, that body began to invade the king's prerogatives, and finally, though remaining formally intact, transferred them to itself.

Both peoples, — the English in England and their descendants in the colonies, — in accordance with their original instincts, have always been moving toward popular rights, but with a difference in their methods. With the colonists every act, every procedure, and all governmental forms (so far as original with them), conformed to and expressed the substantial facts on which they purported to rest. But with the British people, on the other hand, substance changes, but forms endure. The government is essentially popular, but in theory and in form, the sovereign is the substantive head of all its branches. The Ship of State makes her voyage with the old sea-chart conspicuously displayed in the cabin; but the sailing orders are on the binnacle.

This fact receives exemplification in connection with the Talcott Papers.

The Navigation Acts, though affecting colonial interests, grew out of an imperial policy rather than a colonial policy; and therefore their enactment by Parliament may not be regarded as in derogation of the king's prerogative in respect to the colonial government. But the British statutes are full of acts regulating colonial domestic trade, manufactures, finance, and internal government, — prerogative matters. The claim of parliamentary authority over such affairs is shown in the instance to be found in the text; and others are given by Hutchinson. In 1728, when the Massachusetts House of Representatives refused, as its predecessors had done from the time of Governor Dudley, to obey the king's instructions to grant Governor Burnett a fixed and permanent salary, the Committee in the king's Council advised "the interposition of the British legislature, wherein, in our humble opinion, no time should be lost" (*Hist. of Mass.*, vol. ii. p. 356 n.). And again, in 1730, it was declared that "his majesty will find himself under a necessity of laying the undutiful behavior of the province before the legislature of Great Britain, not only in this single instance, but in many others of the same nature and tendency" (*Ibid.* p. 372). But these, and

Lechmere case, the hardship which its decision brought upon the people of Connecticut, and the necessity for relief, concluding with the following prayer:—

“Your petitioners humbly pray, that you would be pleased to give leave that a Bill may be brought into this present Parliament of Great Britain to confirm to the Inhabitants of the said Colony the Estates they now hold and are in possession of under the said distribution of Intestates real Estates, and to quiet them therein, and to enable them to divide the lands of Intestates in the same manner for the future, with a saving clause as to the said John Winthrop, the Colony no way desiring to have the determination made by your Majesty in his case

similar declarations in respect to colonial invasions of the king's prerogatives, were mere threats which soon lost their force; for the opposition, merely as such, frequently stood by the colonies, and in the doubtful state of the Constitution at that time the ministry were unwilling to submit the king's colonial prerogatives to the control of Parliament. But in the legislation which did pass, by what device was the theory of the Constitution maintained? On this last point I can throw some light.

When either House of Parliament deemed parliamentary intervention in domestic colonial affairs essential to the interests of the colony or those of the empire, it was inaugurated by a humble petition to *his Majesty for leave to bring in a Bill* to that end. But had the king refused to permit any such infringement of his prerogatives? No ministry would have dared such advice to the king, or having dared, would have long held its place; and so the king held his prerogative, and Parliament his power.

It was in this way that Parliament gained jurisdiction of internal colonial affairs, though Franklin and the other patriotic leaders, and some in the British Parliament, always denied its constitutional validity. But finally the pretence of the king's leave was laid aside, and the parliamentary authority over the colonies was acknowledged by the king himself, even George III.; for in 1774 he sent a message to the House “that they will not only enable His Majesty effectually to take such measures as may be most likely to put a stop to present disorders, but will also take into their most serious consideration what further and permanent provisions may be necessary to be established for the better securing the execution of the Laws, and just dependence of the colonies upon the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain” (House Journal, vol. xxxiv. p. 54).

Of the influence of the colonies on British constitutional changes I must speak more briefly. It has been often said that the rapid progress of liberal principles, both in England and in France, after the close of the Revolutionary War, was due largely to that event. However that may have been, it is more to my purpose to learn their influence at a much earlier period,—say from the Restoration of Charles II. in 1660. Direct influence doubtless was small. The colonies were remote, little known, and of little interest either to the British people or to the British Government.

But it is to be remembered that during the period of which I am speaking the greater number of questions concerning commerce, colonial manufactures, war, and diplomacy in respect to which the interests of the Crown and of the British people might conflict, and therefore draw the prerogative into question, were colonial questions. Colonial influence was small; but colonial affairs were an important factor in British constitutional progress.

varied, in regard the particular circumstances of his case differ from most others in the Colony, and that your Majesty would cause such your Leave and Permission to be signified to the Hono'ble House of Commons in such manner as to your Majesty shall seem proper."

It was considered by the king in Council, and, April 10, 1730, referred to the Lords of the Committee for hearing Appeals, Complaints, etc., from the Plantations, to consider and report thereon; and by this committee, on the 15th, sent to the Commissioners for Trade and Plantations.

There the matter rested, under the charge of solicitor John Sharp, until April 23, 1730, when Belcher, who had been appointed governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, resigned his agency, and left its business with Francis Wilks, a most faithful and competent man.

In the mean time affairs in Connecticut were in a bad way, and rapidly growing worse. July 1, 1730, Governor Talcott wrote to Jeremy Dummer: —

"Though some hundreds of persons in this Colony have died intestate just before and since the Royall Decree of his Majesty in Council came to us, declaring our law void, we have been so observant to his Majesty's Order that not an Estate so fallen, as I know of, hath been settled by us, but all lie still, though to the grievance of many orphans and fatherless children, who must wait on his Majesty's Royall Pleasure."

How the interests of the Connecticut people fared before the Board of Trade may be learned from a letter of Francis Wilks to Governor Talcott, February 13, 1731. It appears that he, Dummer, and Winthrop had been ordered to attend their Lordships, and on coming in, "Dummer very handsomely set forth how just and necessary it was that what has been acted in the Colony upon the Law for the Division of Intestate Estates for many years should be confirmed." This, Winthrop opposed. "He also affirm'd that the People of that Colony groan'd under the Burthen of Impositions impos'd on them under a notion of Charter Priviledges, and was there to be a Poll taken throughout the Province a great Majority wou'd be for giving up the Charter," etc.

From what Dummer learned of the report on the subject made by the Board of Trade and Plantations to the king in Council, he understood that it was favorable to the confirmation of estates as divided under the act declared null and void.

But he added — what the Governor must have read with dismay: “I am inform’d in the same Report they take notice and give it as their opinion, that the footing of the Colony is upon at present, under their present Charter, is no ways consistent with the Constitution or Interests of Great Britain, and therefore recommended it that the Legislature of this Kingdom shou’d grant a New Charter, better calculated for the Government of your own Body and more consistent with the Honour and Interests of Great Britain. Upon this footing and in this light I apprehend the Affair will be brought into Parliament.” Under these circumstances Wilks might well hesitate, as he did, and wait for particular instructions before bringing the matter into Parliament.

If Wilks correctly reported the recommendation of the Board, as it appears later that he did, it marks a changing constitutional policy in the direction of parliamentary supremacy over the colonies which finally led to the severance of the empire.¹

When the General Assembly convened after Governor Talcott had received the report of the Board of Trade, he laid it and Winthrop’s hostile memorial before that body, and, June 29, 1731, wrote to Wilks giving his opinion about “Mr. Winthrop,” and, among other things, said as follows :

“I am therefore desir’d by our Assembly to let you know that, altho’, as their Lordships say, the annulling the act for dividing the lands of intestates must and will be attended with great confusion amongst our people, yet if we cannot have relief in that grievance without foregoing our present Charter, &c., we are not willing for the sake of the former to submit to the latter, nor to hazard the Charter by bringing it into Parliament on such a footing, and our Assembly are well satisfied with your prudent conduct in not proceeding without our further instructions in so hazardous a case.”

And there the matter remained unsettled for nearly two years, when Wilks replied, April 14, 1733, “that there is very little hopes of procuring one without agreeing to the other ; for which reason I have judged it most proper to let the Colony Petition rest.”

Nearly a year later Wilks wrote to the Governor : “I was

¹ If the significance of the Winthrop-Lechmere case and the proceedings which grew out of it have been duly recognized in any history of the period, I have failed to notice it.

present one day in the House of Lords, when it was mentioned in a speech that the Constitution of some of our Plantations was inconsistent with the Interests of England, and ought to be new Model'd; but whether anything of that nature be designed I know not"; and again, May 4, 1734, he wrote of resolutions of the House of Lords, one of which was aimed at Connecticut, and all of them expressing opinions and making recommendations quite hostile to the long-established rights and usages of the colonies, and which excited considerable alarm in Connecticut.

In the mean time another case — that of *Phillips vs. Savage* — had been carried by appeal from the Superior Court of Massachusetts to the king in Council. This case, essentially the same as that of *Winthrop vs. Lechmere*, was decided differently, — sustaining the Massachusetts law, although, like that of Connecticut, contrary to the English law. Encouraged by this result, the Connecticut law was again brought before the king in Council, by a private suit, and was sustained by a decree rendered July 18, 1745. Thus, after nearly twenty years of unsettled property rights and peril to their Charter, the ancient law was restored to the people of Connecticut, and their Charter remained unaltered; but after such experience and enforced consideration of their relations to the Crown and to Parliament, they were quite different from what they had been, and more fully prepared for that efficient questioning of the constitutional relations of the colonies to the mother country which opened the Revolution on the passage of the Boston Port Bill, and the modification of the Charter of Massachusetts by Act of Parliament.

Although I have given much space to the case of *Winthrop vs. Lechmere*, I have not exhausted its interesting details, nor brought forward all the questions of constitutional law which it presents. The volume contains other matters of similar import, such, for example, as the right of adjacent colonies to settle boundary disputes without the intervention of the Crown, Navigation Laws and Acts of Trade, the importation of Negroes, the Sugar Act, and matters Ecclesiastical, in respect to all which the relations of the colony to the home government were brought sharply into view, forming causes of irritation and matters of education for the final attitude of Connecticut in 1775. A similar state of things doubtless had existed in

other colonies, producing like results. Indeed, nothing is becoming more clear in the light of authentic history disclosed by similar publications, than that the American Revolution was no sudden outbreak of discontent, but rather the culmination of causes coeval with the colonial state, which acquired new vigor with the restoration of the Stuarts, and operated intermittently to the end.

On this point perhaps the evidence from the Talcott Papers is cumulative rather than new, though from the method of its presentation more striking than in any other form in which it has come to my notice.

There is another matter in respect to which our generally accepted history seemingly must be modified. It is this: that the causes of discontent, irritation, and ultimate revolution had their origin in the arbitrary disposition of successive British monarchs, ministries, and parliaments, who in their anger conceived measures hostile to the colonies and persisted in them with wilful blindness; or, if prompted by any other motive than despotic malignity, they were the suggestions of British placemen in the American service, of whom Edward Randolph was a type.

But the facts disclosed by authentic documents do not warrant this view. Dudley at an early day, and Hutchinson sixty years later, were regarded as specially disloyal to their native colony; and though, as I think, some injustice has been done to the former, and grievous wrong to the latter, it is historical that the Navigation Acts of Charles II., oppressive to the colonists, and fatal to their prosperity had they been effectively executed, were the suggestion of Sir George Downing, a graduate of Harvard College; that the Sugar Act of 1733, causing great hardship, and evaded only at the cost of widespread demoralization from the smuggling it occasioned, became a law on the petition and ceaseless activity of John Yeamans, a Boston merchant and large landed proprietor; and that the ecclesiastical turmoil in which the northern colonies were involved for sixty years, did not grow out of the desire of the Bishop of London to impose an episcopate on them, but of the efforts of native churchmen who desired the protection and countenance of the hierarchy. To these facts must now be added another printed for the first time, so far as I am aware, in the Talcott Papers: that one who bore a name then, as

now and ever, honored in New England, not content with having gained his cause, sought to overthrow the Connecticut Charter obtained by his grandfather, and incited the Board of Trade to adopt, or recommend to the government, a system of measures in no essential respects different from those which brought on the revolt of the colonies.

Mr. R. C. WINTHROP, JR., said : —

I wish to communicate two unpublished letters which indirectly relate to the manner in which the Society became possessed of the most important of its early colonial manuscripts. The first of them was written in 1769 to my great-grandfather by Gov. Jonathan Trumbull, who was desirous to effect an examination, for historical purposes, of the Winthrop papers then preserved in New London.

John Still Winthrop, Esq^r, New London.

LEBANON, 29th Nov^r 1769.

SIR, — I am appointed with Col^o Wyllys to look up such papers as are of consequence to the Colony, not in the possession of the Secretary, — among others, the Deed from Lord Say & Seal, Lord Brook &c, of the Earl Warwick's Rights, sold by Col^o Fenwick to this Colony, whereof they were to make the Conveyances, — & also the antient Transactions relative to the Colony of Rhode Island, & such other papers as might be obtained, & needfull to be preserved.

It hath been observed to me that 'tis likely many papers of consequence relative to the Colony are left by the late Hon^{ble} our first Gov^r Winthrop, your great-grandfather, & now in your possession, — possibly the Deed first mentioned & the Transactions with Rhode Island. These are to ask the favour of you to examine after them & other curious papers that may concern the Colony & its history, & communicate to me what may be found. I have wrote to Cap^t Jeremiah Miller & desired him to wait on you to promote this request. I am with great truth & regard, Sir,

Your most Obedient & very Humble Servant,

JONTH TRUMBULL.

In compliance with this request a partial examination of the papers was made, Trumbull being allowed to retain some of them for the Connecticut Archives, and to borrow others upon the understanding that they should be eventually returned. John Still Winthrop, to whom the original applica-

tion was addressed, died in 1776, aged fifty-seven; but the same permission was renewed by his eldest son, John Winthrop, who was graduated at Harvard in 1770, and died unmarried ten years later. The ownership of the collection then passed to his next brother, Francis Bayard Winthrop, who resided chiefly in New York, and, after Trumbull's death in 1785, appears to have taken no steps for the recovery of the borrowed manuscripts, but ultimately acquiesced in their being included in the gift to this Society by Trumbull's sons, in 1794, of the bulk of their father's papers. My grandfather, Thomas Lindall Winthrop, was then residing in Boston, but did not become one of our members until 1800, not long after which he discovered that two precious manuscript volumes of Winthrop's Journal, known to have been borrowed by Trumbull, had unaccountably disappeared. Investigation developed that they had been loaned by the Trumbull family to our founder, Dr. Belknap, from whose heirs they were recovered by my grandfather and presented to this Society by his brother Francis, their legal owner. Many of these facts are described in a paper read to us by my father in June, 1872;¹ but at the time he wrote it he had not seen the letter which I have just communicated, nor was he aware of the existence of the following one from John Porter, then Comptroller of Public Accounts in Connecticut, and previously Secretary to Governor Trumbull during the Revolutionary period, whose testimony on the subject is authoritative and circumstantial. Had it come to light earlier, it would undoubtedly have been quoted by Mr. Savage in the preface to his edition of Winthrop's Journal, as well as by Mr. Charles Deane in the introduction to his volume of selections from the Trumbull papers;² and it is therefore desirable to have it in print for reference.

Mr Francis Bayard Winthrop, New York.

HARTFORD, July 8th 1803.

SIR, — Your letter of the 13th of June was received yesterday. Being addressed to me at Lebanon, it was taken from the post office there by a person in that place who bears the same name with me, and by him opened; but perceiving the mistake he returned the letter to the post office and caused it to be conveyed to me here. It is about 14 years since I removed from Lebanon & have ever since resided in this town.

¹ Proceedings, vol. xii. pp. 233-236.

² 5 Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. ix.

With respect to the manuscript Journals of your venerable ancestor, they were borrowed from your brother by the late Gov^r. Trumbull about the commencement of the American Revolution. During my residence with Gov^r. Trumbull I transcribed two of the volumes entitled the History of New England. There were three volumes of these manuscripts by him borrowed, — the third contained miscellaneous writings, penned in a very neat and elegant hand. Soon after Gov^r. Trumbull's decease, and while I lived in Lebanon, I borrowed the historical manuscripts & transcribed them a second time, and then returned them to his Executor, M^r. David Trumbull. The present Gov^r. Trumbull, I remember, remarked at that time that these manuscripts ought to be returned to the Winthrop family. I supposed it had been done until, some time since, I was informed to the contrary. I apprehend, Sir, that they were taken from Lebanon by the late D^r. Belknap, who was there several years ago and, on solicitation, was permitted by Gov^r. Trumbull's Executor to take away such of the public papers as he might find useful for his purpose. Doubtless, in the examination, he met with these manuscripts and failed not to take them. Subsequent to this there was a similar application from the Massachusetts Historical Society, and the residue of Gov^r. Trumbull's public papers were delivered over to them. These Winthrop manuscripts being lent in the first instance may be remanded back wherever found.

I will write to the present Gov^r. Trumbull on the subject, and if I learn from him anything materially different, or more particular than what I have stated, will give you further advice.

I am, with respect, Sir,

Your very Obedient Servant,

JOHN PORTER.

Although Jonathan Trumbull has ever been held in just veneration as one of the glories of our Revolutionary period and, to use the words of Washington, "the first of patriots," yet there has been occasionally exhibited in his native Connecticut a disposition to complain that he filed with his personal and private papers a number of official documents and many manuscripts collected by him in the exercise of his functions as record-commissioner, without leaving any lists by which these different classes of material could be identified. So pronounced did this feeling become that, in 1845, the Governor of that State, acting under instructions from its General Assembly, made a friendly application to us for a considerable part of our Trumbull papers, on the ground that they really belonged to the Connecticut Archives. To this request this

Society respectfully declined to accede, after listening to a report on the subject from a Committee consisting of James Savage, Josiah Quincy, and Isaac P. Davis, who pointed out the absence of any evidence of ownership beyond the admitted facts that the papers in question were in Trumbull's house in Lebanon at the time of his death, that they continued in the undisputed possession of his family for nine years afterward, and were freely given away by his heirs in 1794. Nearly half a century has passed away since this claim was presented, and it is not at all likely that it will be renewed; but if a similar representation should ever again be made, the evidence I now furnish establishes that the most valuable of the Colonial manuscripts in Trumbull's possession at the time of his death belonged neither to himself nor to the State of Connecticut, but to a private family who had loaned them to him for historical purposes and who subsequently approved their transfer to this Society.

I will add a few words on another subject. Our sister Society in Connecticut is not so well provided with publishing-funds as we could wish, and its members sometimes seek the aid of the local press in making public the results of their investigations. A newspaper article soon becomes practically buried unless an allusion to it can be found in some work of reference; and it is in order to effect such a reference in the next index to our own Proceedings that I wish briefly to allude to the antiquarian interest attaching to an article in the "Hartford Courant" of the 4th ult., upon the grave of Thomas Hooker, by our Corresponding Member, Mr. Hoadly, Vice-President of the Connecticut Historical Society. The original headstone placed over Hooker's remains after his death at Hartford, in 1647, seems to have disappeared in the remote past, though his grave continued to be identified by popular tradition, and early in the present century it was felt to be imperative that so eminent a man should not be any longer left without some sort of local commemoration. It was decided to use for the purpose some carved stones, without any inscription or any apparent means of identification, which from time immemorial had been lying very near the spot, and which, on being put together, formed one of those Colonial monuments technically known as "tables," consisting of two large stone slabs, the upper one supported by carved legs or pillars, several examples of which

may be seen in the graveyard beneath our windows. By a chain of documentary evidence which I will not quote at length, Mr. Hoadly establishes the strongest probability, short of absolute certainty, that the monument thus inscribed to Hooker in 1818 was originally ordered to commemorate Elizabeth Reade, second wife of Gov. John Winthrop, Jr., who died at Hartford in November, 1672, and whose name is additionally familiar to historians from her having been the step-daughter of Hugh Peter and the cherished friend of Roger Williams. It is shown that she and Hooker were buried near each other, and that, as early as the spring of 1683, her son Fitz-John Winthrop was in correspondence with John Allyn of Hartford about an inscription for her grave-stone. Why this was not then attended to does not appear; but it is further shown that, a number of years afterward, her younger son, Wait Winthrop, was also in correspondence about a suitable inscription for his mother's monument, the architectural character of which is clearly indicated in a letter from the stone-cutter. By a curious fatality both brothers died leaving the task unfinished; and as the lady's surviving relatives resided at a distance, the matter gradually passed into oblivion. The facts ingeniously disinterred by Mr. Hoadly are rather of local antiquarian than of historical interest; but I think it appropriate that there should be a reference to them in our Proceedings, because much of the documentary evidence upon which they rest is contained in two volumes of our Collections, edited in recent years by Mr. Smith and myself, in which this Hooker monument would certainly have been alluded to if he or I had been at all aware of the associations connected with it.¹

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN called the attention of the members to the original portrait of Dr. Increase Mather, — which had been brought down from the picture-gallery, — as well as to some early engravings taken from the painting, and made the following remarks: —

At the last meeting of the Society an old miniature of Dr. Increase Mather, painted in oil, was presented to the Cabinet

¹ See the "Hartford Courant" of Feb. 4, 1893; 6 Mass. Hist. Coll. vol. iii. pp. 471, 472; *Ibid.*, vol. v. p. 321; see also several letters from James and William Stancliffe, stone-masons, among the unpublished Winthrop papers.

by one of his descendants, Mrs. Elizabeth Anna (Byles) Ellis, of Burlington, New Jersey. The portrait is oval in shape, about four inches by five in size, and is enclosed in a leaden frame. It represents only his bust, and while not a work of high art, undoubtedly dates back to the period of Dr. Mather's lifetime. The painting is on paper, and was evidently copied from an engraving of him, either by White or Sturt, which is found in several of his books. The two engravings made by these artists are so much alike that it is difficult now to say which served as the model, but probably it was Sturt's. The dimensions of the head and shoulders in the miniature correspond closely in all respects, even in many minute details, with those in the engraved portraits, with this exception that everything is reversed. Apparently the artist placed the engraving against a pane of window-glass, and then drew the outlines of his picture from the back of the likeness, and afterward filled in the details.

These early prints of Dr. Mather have been the subject of so much confusion and of such inaccurate statement in various works that I am led to describe them in detail. Fortunately the painting which is the original source of both these engravings, has been for nearly a century in the possession of the Historical Society, where it was given formally at the quarterly meeting held on January 30, 1798, by Mrs. Hannah (Mather) Crocker. It is a portrait of three quarters length and life-size, about three feet and five inches by four feet and two inches in dimensions, and near the lower left-hand corner bears the name of the artist "Joh vander Sprjtt" with the date 1688. He is represented seated at a table with two large volumes open before him, evidently theological works; and on the edge of a book-shelf above are these words "*Ætatis. suæ. 49 1688.*" which furnish a double confirmation of the time when the portrait was painted.

Mrs. Crocker was the youngest child of the Reverend Dr. Samuel Mather, of Boston, and great-granddaughter of the subject of the portrait. She married Joseph Crocker, of Boston, a graduate of Harvard College in the Class of 1774, who died on November 13, 1797; and the picture came here very soon afterward. Her family had been considerably interested in the objects of the Society, as her brother-in-law Allen Crocker had previously given at various times both to the

Library and Cabinet, and the executors of her father's estate had also presented valuable books from the Mather collection, which are still in our possession.

By a coincidence, at the same meeting of the Society another portrait of Dr. Mather, a small mezzotint, was given by John Dugan. It is glued on wood, and enclosed in an old-fashioned frame, which is undoubtedly contemporaneous with the engraving. On the back of the little picture is pasted a paper with this inscription: "Presented to the Historical Society by John Dugan 1797," though the gift was not formally announced to the members until January 30, 1798. Under the portrait is the following legend:—

Vera

CRESCENTII MATHERI

Effigies

Anno Domini 1683 Ætatis 44

T. Johnson Fecit

The artist was probably Thomas Johnston, who died in Boston, on May 8, 1767, aged 59 years, and lies buried in the King's Chapel Burying-ground. Presumably the mezzotint was made from an original picture painted in 1683, when Mather was 44 years old, and the line "Anno Domini 1683 Ætatis 44" was copied from the canvas by the engraver; but all this, however, is mere conjecture. Johnston was an artist of respectability, and had practised as an heraldic painter. "The Boston Evening-Post," May 11, 1767, has the following notice of his death:—

"Last Friday Morning died here Mr. *Thomas Johnston*, Japanner, Painter and Engraver, after a short illness, having been seized with an Apoplectic Fit a few Days before."

Curiously enough, after the lapse of years in the records of the Society, these two pictures of Dr. Increase Mather, like the babies in "Pinafore," got badly mixed up. In the List of Portraits belonging to the Cabinet, as printed near the end of a volume of Collections (Third Series, VII.), which was published in the year 1838, the portrait of Dr. Mather is described as "a very old painting" (page 290), and given by Mr. John Dugan. The little mezzotint was entirely overlooked by the compiler of the list, and was not even mentioned in his cata-

logue; and since that time the oil portrait has been duly accredited, both in print and manuscript, to Mr. Dugan.

Dr. Mather's portrait was painted in 1688, during his visit to England, where, as an agent of the Massachusetts Colony, he had gone in the spring of that year. The artist was John vander Spriett, a Dutch mezzotint engraver of little note, who had studied under Verkolie at Amsterdam, where he had painted a few portraits. He afterward went to London, and died there about the year 1700. Presumably Dr. Mather, on his return home in the spring of 1692, brought back to Boston this painting of himself. Inasmuch as his eldest child, Dr. Cotton Mather, inherited the larger part of his estate, it is very likely that the picture passed into that son's possession, and thence into the hands of his grandson Samuel.

Within a few months after Dr. Mather's portrait was painted in London, it was engraved by Robert White, an English artist of some note (born 1645, died 1704), who had made many other likenesses of distinguished persons. It is a small copperplate engraving, about six inches by four in size, representing the bust in an oval frame, and the whole resting on a pedestal, and bears the legend "Crescentius Matherus. | Ætatis Suæ 49. 1688." In the two lower corners, below the pedestal, are the following words, in small script: "Vander-spirit pinxit. R. White Sculp. Londini." It is of excellent workmanship, the hatching is soft and delicate, and the handling of the hair graceful. While the engraver has taken some liberties in his production and has slightly changed the pose of the figure, it is evident that he followed this identical portrait. The plate has been used for impressions to be framed as well as to be inserted in Mather's works.

Nearly two years after Mather's death, the same engraving by White was used again, though with a change in the legend, so that it reads "Crescentius Matherus. | S. T. P. Obiit Aug. 23. 1723 Ætatis Suæ 85," but with the names of the same artists in the two lower corners beneath the pedestal. The print appears as a frontispiece to a small volume entitled "Memoirs of the Life of the Reverend Increase Mather, D.D. Who died August 23, 1723. With a Preface by the Reverend Edmund Calamy, D.D. London: Printed for John Clark and Richard Hett at the Bible and Crown in the Poultry, near Cheapside, MDCCXXV." Presumably the publishers owned

or controlled the plate, and had the necessary change made in the second line of the legend to suit the emergency. It will be noticed that the age is given incorrectly.

Another engraving of the Mather portrait was made by John Sturt, an English engraver (born 1658, died 1730), who had been one of Robert White's pupils. This plate was cut originally only one year after White's, and the resemblance between the two prints is so close that it requires a careful scrutiny to distinguish them. There is a slight difference in size between the buttons of each coat, and this forms the principal variation. The likenesses and the details of the two engravings are so similar that I am inclined to think that Sturt's engraving was made from White's, and not directly from the portrait, as White's was. The workmanship of Sturt's is not quite as good, particularly the cross-hatching, and the figure seems a little stiffer. The legend in his print reads as follows: "Crescentius Matherus | *Ætatis Suæ* 50. 1689." The copies of this impression commonly seen are so cut down to fit the volumes in which they are found, that the engraver's name is gone. I have seen the print both in Mather's "Angelographia" (Boston, 1696), and in his "Discourse proving that the Christian Religion is the only True Religion:" etc. (Boston, 1702), — the one a small octavo volume, and the other a small duodecimo.

The legend of the next issue is as follows: "Crescentius Matherus. | *Ætatis Suæ* 80. 1719," — and in the lower right-hand corner, under the pedestal, is the name of the engraver "I. Sturt Sculp:" With the exception of the age and the date in the second line of the legend, the print is exactly like the first issue, though it is easy still to make out faint traces of the old figures indicating these facts. This engraving is found in Mather's "Sermons wherein those Eight Characters of the Blessed commonly called the Beatitudes, are Opened & Applied in Fifteen Discourses" (Boston, 1718); and though there is a discrepancy between the dates, copies of the book may have been bound up with the plate at a period subsequent to its publication.

The legend of the third issue reads thus: "Crescentius Matherus. | *Ætatis Suæ* 85. 1724." — with the name of the artist in the lower right-hand corner, "I. Sturt Sculp:" Again, with the exception of the age and the date in the

legend, the engraving is precisely the same as the other two, and traces of the earlier figures are still also visible. This plate is found in Dr. Cotton Mather's "Memoirs of Remarkables in the Life and the Death" of his father, a book which from the first word on the titlepage is generally called "Parentator" (Boston, 1724). There is a singular mistake in the legend, which gives Dr. Mather's age as 85 years in 1724, whereas he died on August 23, 1723, aged 84 years; but this blunder was made by the artist in England. Perhaps the second issue of the engraving was dated a year in advance, which would explain why an impression of 1719 was inserted in a book published in 1718, as mentioned on the previous page.

A singular fact connected with these two engravings by White and Sturt is that, while they both were made originally during the middle life of Dr. Mather, they were struck off at different intervals through a period of many years, with a change in his age, as given under the engraving to correspond with the date, so that the likeness at fifty appears exactly as it did more than thirty years later, when he was past eighty.

Nearly two years ago, at the meeting held on May 14, 1891, our associate Mr. Whitmore showed a copy of "The Blessed Hope, and the Glorious Appearing of the Great GOD our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Opened & Applied, in Several Sermons" (Boston, 1701), which contained a rare engraving of Dr. Mather, the author. In the Boston Public Library are two copies of "Ichabod. or, A Discourse showing what Cause there is to Fear that the Glory of the Lord, is departing from New-England" (Boston, 1702), — one of them being in the Prince Collection, and the other in the general library, — and each containing the same print, but in a different stage of development. The engraver evidently followed either the White or the Sturt print, and made a rude and rough fac-simile, which is a little smaller than the original engraving. On the pedestal is the name of "Increase. Mather"; and underneath on the lowest part are these words: "Tho: Emmes. sculp: ||||| Sold by Nicolas Boone. 1701." This has no engraved background, and the head is shrouded in white; but the other is cross-hatched, showing a later stage of the engraving, and is dated 1702. The work was evidently done here, and by an engraver who is not now known. Mr. Whitmore's impression

is dated 1701, and is the finished engraving, showing that the plate received its final touches during that year.

According to Savage's Genealogical Dictionary, the name of Emmes is a variation of Eames; and perhaps the artist was Thomas, eldest child of Thomas and Mary (Paddleford) Eames, of Cambridge, who was baptized on July 12, 1663.

Another engraved likeness from the portrait appears in the second volume of "The New England Historical & Genealogical Register" for January, 1848, where it faces page 9. It was made near that time by Oliver Pelton, probably from Sturt's engraving.

The Society's painting of Dr. Mather was also engraved in the year 1851 by Wagstaff (Charles E.) and Andrews (Joseph), of Boston; and the engraving is given as a frontispiece to "A History of the Second Church, or Old North, in Boston" (1852), by our late associate, the Reverend Dr. Chandler Robbins. In the lower left-hand corner appear these words: "Vanveck Pinx^t 1680," which inscription is an error both as to the artist as well as the date. The print gives a little more of the painting than either White's or Sturt's, though not the whole of it, and represents Mather's left forefinger pointing at something which does not appear in the engraving, but which in the picture is an open book.

I have seen an engraving of Dr. Mather, made probably near the beginning of the present century, where he is represented in a gown and bands, and with a wig, and has a somewhat fuller face than in the Society's portrait. It was "from an original Painting in the Possession of M^r Townsend, Holborn," though I can learn nothing in regard to either the picture or the engraving. The print belongs to Mr. Sumner Hollingsworth of this city, who has a large and interesting collection of early Boston imprints and other rare books, and I am indebted to his courtesy for the use of it.

Nathaniel Mather, under date of March 2, 1680-1, writes from Dublin to his younger brother Increase:—

"I have received sundry from you; with severall books and your picture by M^r David Hart, and one by M^r Eales: For all which I thank you." (Collections, Fourth Series, VIII. 28.)

The meaning of this extract, undoubtedly, is that Nathaniel had received from his brother several books and his picture

brought by Mr. Hart, as well as a book brought by Mr. Eales. The picture here alluded to was probably an engraving, which rather implies a portrait painted before this period. The statement in the letter is Dr. Appleton's authority for saying that a picture of Increase Mather was made in Boston previous to this time. (Proceedings, X. 47.)

Akin to this subject it may be proper to refer to an old engraving, which has belonged to the Cabinet of the Society for many years. It is of the rudest sort, showing a half-length portrait, which bears the legend "Mr. Richard Mather," who was the father of Increase. It was given on January 27, 1807, by Arthur Maynard Walter, a descendant of the early Puritan minister. The print is about five inches by six in size, not including the name underneath, and represents Mather holding a pair of very small eyeglasses in his right hand, and an open book in his left. It is engraved on wood, but not boxwood, apparently on the flat side of a board, as the longitudinal grain of the wood can be detected in the engraving. The block was in two pieces; and the head and shoulders constituting the upper block, being too narrow for the lower part, did not fit together by nearly a quarter of an inch. Perhaps the lower block, or the body of the engraving, had previously been used to represent the body of some one else. A similar engraving is in the possession of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester.

I have long had a notion that this cut was the work of John Foster, the pioneer printer of Boston, who was born and brought up in Mr. Mather's parish at Dorchester. He was a graduate of Harvard College in the Class of 1667, and, about the time of Mather's death, which occurred on April 22, 1669, he was teaching school in his native town. In the Proceedings (Second Series, IV. 199-206) for November, 1888, I have given certain reasons for supposing that he was the earliest engraver of New England.

Candor compels me, however, to add that there is a watermark in the paper of this print, which is identical with that found in a pamphlet entitled "A Conference of his Excellency Jonathan Belcher, Esq.," printed in the year 1732; and nearly the same as that seen in the issue of "The Boston Weekly News-Letter," June 24, 1731, and also in that of

“The New-England Weekly Journal,” January 10, 1732, as well as in a few other subsequent numbers of both these newspapers. A similar water-mark is found in several manuscript letter-books, once belonging to Governor Belcher, and containing copies of his correspondence, but now in the possession of this Society. The letters begin on September 3, 1731, and run on with some breaks for a dozen years. The books were given to the Library by Dr. Belknap more than a century ago.

Edward L. Pierce, LL.D., of Milton, was elected a Resident Member.

Rev. Edward G. Porter, Mr. John C. Ropes, and Rev. Octavius B. Frothingham were appointed a committee to nominate officers to be balloted for at the annual meeting; Hon. Roger Wolcott and Mr. Hamilton A. Hill, a committee to examine the treasurer's accounts; and Rev. Dr. Samuel E. Herrick, Mr. George S. Merriam, and Hon. Henry S. Nourse, a committee to examine the Library and Cabinet.

Mr. Horace E. Scudder communicated the memoir of Henry W. Longfellow, which he had been appointed to write for the Proceedings. Remarks were also made during the meeting by Mr. Charles F. Adams, Dr. William Everett, Prof. James B. Thayer, Mr. Charles C. Smith, and other members.

A new serial of the Proceedings, containing the communications made at the December, January, and February meetings, was ready for distribution at this meeting.

MEMOIR
OF
HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW, LL.D.¹

BY HORACE E. SCUDDER.

HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW, whose descent is traced from William Longfellow of Byfield, Massachusetts, an English immigrant of the third quarter of the seventeenth century, was the son of Stephen and Zilpha (Wadsworth) Longfellow. He was born in a house still standing at the corner of Fore and Hancock streets, Portland, Maine, February 27, 1807. He was trained for college at the Portland Academy, and in 1821 entered Bowdoin College (founded but twenty years before), was graduated in 1825, and immediately received an invitation to teach the modern languages in his Alma Mater, with a leave of absence for travel and study in Europe.

He sailed for France in May, 1826, where he spent the rest of that year. Early in 1827 he went to Spain for eight months. A year followed in Italy; and after six months in Germany, he returned to America in the summer of 1829. In September of that year he entered upon his duties at Brunswick as Professor of Modern Languages. In September, 1831, he was married to Mary Storer Potter, second daughter of Judge Barrett Potter of Portland. His study and his writing during his residence at Brunswick made him at last feel restricted in opportunity; and he was casting about for some more congenial position, when he received, in December, 1834, an invitation to succeed Mr. George Ticknor as Smith Professor of

¹ In 1886 the writer of this memoir edited the Riverside edition of Longfellow's complete writings. In doing this he furnished the edition with somewhat full introductions and notes; and as these contained the results of his study of the poet's life and works, he has not hesitated to use them freely in the preparation of this memoir.



Modern Languages in Harvard University, and at once accepted the offer with enthusiasm.

The invitation gave an intimation that he might if he chose spend a year or eighteen months in Europe for the purpose of perfecting himself in German ; and in April, 1835, he made a second journey of study and observation. He spent the remainder of the year in England, the Scandinavian countries, and Holland, where he was detained by the illness of his wife, who died at the end of November in Rotterdam. Thence he passed to Germany, where he wintered in Heidelberg, occupying himself closely in study. Near the end of June he went to the Tyrol, spent the summer in Switzerland, and by slow stages made his way to Havre, whence he sailed for home in October, 1836.

In December of this year he established himself in Cambridge, and took up his college duties. In the summer of 1837 he found quarters in the historic house which had been Washington's headquarters during the siege of Boston, where he had for a while as co-tenant Dr. Joseph Worcester, the lexicographer. The house at the time was owned and occupied by Mrs. Andrew Craigie, widow of a commissary officer in the American army, who bore the distinguished title Apothecary-general. Here Mr. Longfellow lived during the remainder of his life, except that he had also for many years a summer cottage at Nahant. In 1843 he became owner of the estate through the gift of Mr. Nathan Appleton of Boston, whose daughter Frances Elizabeth he married July 13 of that year.

Mr. Longfellow held his professorship in Harvard University from 1836 to 1854, when he resigned the position. Once only, in 1842, did he take a long vacation of six months, which he spent mainly at Marienberg on the Rhine, for the sake of its waters. In July, 1861, he met with a terrible loss in the distressing death, by fire, of his wife. He led after this a somewhat secluded life ; but in May, 1868, he went to Europe for a fourth time, with members of his family, and remained abroad, receiving academic honors and everywhere accorded such distinction as his great fame won him and his sensitive nature would permit him to receive. He returned to his home in September, 1869, and died March 24, 1882, leaving two sons and three daughters.

Besides the degree of Doctor of Laws conferred on him by his

Alma Mater, Bowdoin College, Mr. Longfellow received the same decoration from Harvard University and from Cambridge, England, the degree of Doctor of Civil Law from the University of Oxford, and was member, among other societies, of the Royal Spanish Academy. He was elected a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society in 1857.

In such brief terms may be recorded the external incidents of the life of a man whose name is probably more widely known both in America and in Europe than that of any other American man of letters. The more important and distinguishing record of his life lies in a statement respecting his literary career, and especially the succession of his poetical writings, for his services to his countrymen were only incidentally through his academic avocation; his real vocation was that of a poet, and in that word must be included very distinctly the notion of an interpreter.

Setting aside the boyish verses on the "Battle of Lovell's Pond" with their faint echo of Moore, the first disclosure of poetic gift was in the period when he was closing his college course and immediately after, in the winter which intervened between his appointment at Bowdoin and his first European visit. About twenty-five poems were published in various journals at this time; and seven of them the poet included under the heading "Earlier Poems" in his first collection of original verse, "Voices of the Night," a dozen years later. In this group of early poems there are a few touches which indicate the spark of poetic fire; but for the most part they are derivative, imitative, and merely exercises upon a slender poetic reed. Their chief value is in showing how the author's mind, before he travelled or partook freely of the larger literature, turned instinctively to subjects and to modes of treatment which permitted the artistic use of the reflected forms of nature and human life; he was seeking for color and richness and decorative grace rather than penetrating to the elemental significance.

During this brief period of poetic activity, Mr. Longfellow wrote and printed probably as much prose which has not been preserved. In truth, he was seeking expression through literary form, and was conscious rather of the literary spirit than of a controlling poetic power. It was during his last year in college that he wrote to his father:—

"I most eagerly aspire after future eminence in literature ; my whole soul burns ardently for it, and every earthly thought centres in it. There may be something visionary in this, but I flatter myself that I have prudence enough to keep my enthusiasm from defeating its own object by too great haste. Surely there never was a better opportunity offered for exertion of literary talent in our own country than is now offered. To be sure, most of our literary men thus far have not been profoundly so, until they have studied and entered the practice of theology, law, or medicine. I do believe that we ought to pay more attention to the opinion of philosophers, that 'nothing but nature can qualify a man for knowledge.' Whether Nature has given me any capacity for knowledge or not, she has, at any rate, given me a very strong predilection for literary pursuits ; and I am almost confident in believing that if I can rise in the world, it must be by the exercise of my talent in the wide field of literature. With such a belief I must say that I am unwilling to engage in the study of the law. . . . Let me reside one year at Cambridge ; let me study *belles-lettres*, and after that time it will not require a spirit of prophecy to predict with some degree of certainty what kind of a figure I could make in the literary world."

In this interesting letter there is the note of a young man pleading with his father, and using the argument which he thinks may prevail ; but there is, more distinct than any assumed bravado, an eagerness to try the calling which answers most completely the demands of his nature. Through all the vicissitudes of his professional life, he seems never to have missed the road which his intellectual and emotional endowment pointed out. His life-long friend Mr. George Washington Greene, in the moving dedication to the poet prefixed to his "The Life of Nathanael Greene," recalls a day spent by the two young men in Naples in 1828, when, under the splendor of an Italian sunset, and with the beautiful bay of Naples spread out before them, they reflected on the pageant of history, and then turned their thoughts in upon themselves and their own purposes in life.

"We talked and mused by turns," says Greene, "till the twilight deepened and the stars came forth to mingle their mysterious influences with the overmastering magic of the scene. It was then that you unfolded to me your plans of life, and showed me from what 'deep cisterns' you had already learned to draw. From that day the office of literature took a new place in my thoughts. I felt its forming power as I had never felt it before, and began to look with a calm

resignation upon its trials, and with true appreciation upon its rewards."

There is no corresponding record by the poet himself to which we can turn for the expansion of these words; but there are hints in his letters as well as suggestions from his studies at this time which make it pretty certain that the entrance he then found into the literatures of Southern Europe through the medium of a quick acquaintance with the several languages, was the disclosure to him of the interpreting power of literature; and it is interesting to note that one of the indications at this time of his own adventures in literature pointed to the use of the native, familiar material of New England life. In the midst of his enthusiastic absorption of foreign art, literature, and life, he wrote to Carey & Lea, the Philadelphia publishers, proposing a series of sketches and tales of New England life. He was qualifying himself for the post of an instructor in modern languages; but neither in his purpose then nor in his pursuit of this calling afterward at Brunswick and Cambridge could he be regarded as taking an academic attitude. He taught by methods which were designed to initiate the student as early as possible into an apprehension of the interesting revelation of life which literature held; and his choice of forms of literature for translation into the English tongue led him straight to those poems which embodied human experience in its most sympathetic guise.

There was a period of a little more than ten years from the time when Mr. Longfellow returned from Europe which was marked by literary production and the work of a teacher, blended and interchanged, but expressive of a single controlling passion. Just before his return after a three years' absence, he wrote to his father: "My poetic career is finished. Since I left America I have hardly put two lines together." Both his note-book and his letters show that his mind was occupied mainly with plans for work in prose. In fact, the new world opened to him by his introduction to historic and contemporaneous romantic literature pressed for expression. There was an outlet through teaching, and there was an outlet through writing; and in his eagerness to give form to the impressions crowding upon him, he used his profession for the opportunities it gave him, and wrote lectures and articles for periodicals in which he sought to classify and arrange the wealth which

his study and sojourn in foreign lands had heaped before him. Yet the artistic impulse native to his genius impelled him to use his material in more artistic form. Shortly after his return to America he began the publication in Buckingham's "The New England Magazine" of a series entitled "The School-master," in which a slight framework of fictitious assumption of personality is employed in which to set pictures of foreign life. The series continued for eighteen months, and then was recast and enlarged to be published in book form in 1833, under the title of "Outre-Mer: a Pilgrimage beyond the Sea." It was in effect the harvest of his first years of travel. In 1839 appeared "Hyperion," which followed upon his second residence abroad, and in its form and treatment was more distinctly a work of constructive art. The material which he had amassed was now more completely mastered, and in the freedom of his mastery he employed it for an ulterior artistic purpose, interfusing a lyrical and romantic strain of human sentiment. The book marks the close of what may be regarded as the poet's period of training for his distinct vocation.

Yet during this entire period he had not failed to exercise himself in poetic form as well as in the poetical treatment of the prose form. His function as an interpreter of foreign literature both as teacher and writer drew him into metrical versions of the poems which formed for him so essential a part of that literature. His first book, indeed, aside from school-manuals, was his translation of *Coplas de Manrique*; and his two prose volumes were lighted by lyrics in which his own poetic genius was a transparent medium for the beauty of the originals. As his first great discovery of himself was in the loss of himself in large study and observation, so his appropriation of European literary art was the occasion for a fineness of literary expression quite beyond his earlier independent poetic trials. These translations have a quality which make them distinctively his, while still faithful rescripts of the originals.

The period of this special form of production extended beyond the decade of which we have been writing, and culminated with the publication of "The Poets and Poetry of Europe" in 1843, an anthology which contained a number of his own translations. From 1830 until 1843 he wrote more than sixty such poems, and in this last year made his first

experiments in the translation of Dante. But the most prolific years were precisely those from 1829 to 1839, when he was most busily engaged in assimilating and ordering all that material for art which had been put into his possession by his acquaintance with foreign literature and life.

It was when he had discharged his obligation to this inheritance by the publication of "Hyperion" that he began almost simultaneously his long and noble career as a poet, singing in his own voice the songs which were the overflow of his native genius enriched and expanded by the years of study and experiment. In the flush of his intellectual manhood, established in what promised to be a permanent position in Harvard College, and with his days of wandering over, he turned again to poetry. He was still a student, but the urgency of the student-mood was passed; the riches of human thought had become in a measure his possession; his personal experience had been enlarged and deepened; he no longer saw principally the outside of the world; youth with its surrender to the moment had gone, and manhood with its hours of reflection had come. So we may interpret the poet's mood as it discloses itself in the verses which introduce his first volume of original poetry.

The conclusion of one period of his intellectual growth, as instanced in the writing of "Hyperion," melts into the beginning of a new period, which is indicated by the several Psalms, so called by himself, written and published at the end of 1838 and during 1839. In the latter year Mr. Longfellow gathered these recent poems with those belonging to earlier stages into a volume to which he gave the title "Voices of the Night." It comprised three groups of poems, — those recently written and published in the "Knickerbocker Magazine"; a selection from his poems published in periodicals during and immediately after his college days; and translations, together with a Prelude and an Envoi. The publication seems to have been a sudden thought coming to him in the exhilaration of his busy life. He writes in his diary, under date of September 11, 1839: "I have taken to the Greek poets again, and mean to devote one hour every morning to them. Began to-day with Anacreon. What exquisite language! Why did I ever forget my Greek?" and the next day he notes: "I mean to publish a volume of poems under the title of 'Voices of the Night.' As old Michael Drayton says, —

‘ I will ; yea, and I may !
Who shall oppose my way ?
For what is he alone
That of himself can say
He ’s heire of Helicon ? ’ ”

It was perhaps at the suggestion of his renewed interest in Greek that he gave the title he did to the volume, with a motto from Euripides, the lines in a chorus in “ Orestes ” beginning *πότνια πότνια νῦξ*.

The success of the volume was marked ; and the tone in which the author speaks of it in his diary and letters, as well as the joyousness which pervades his life at this period, indicates how sincere was this new birth of song, and what promise it gave of endurance. Nevertheless he was not so conscious of his destiny that he could not outline, a few days later, a plan of literary work which embraced a history of English poetry, a novel, a series of sketches, and only one poem, which may have been a paraphrase of Scandinavian verse. This efflorescence of intellectual life was, however, only a sign of his activity. It serves to show how natural and progressive was his growth : he had not broken with his past, but he did not distinctly see how almost entirely his literary productiveness was thereafter to be confined to verse. For it is to be noted that after the publication of “ Voices of the Night ” the succession of volumes of poetry was broken only by “ Kavanagh,” and the collection of his scattered papers under the title of “ Drift Wood.” “ Kavanagh,” published in 1849, at the close of another decade, appears to have been the final form taken by his art of various fancies which had been floating in his mind since the period of his first beginnings in literature. It laid their ghost, we may think ; and after that the man of letters ceased to be, and the poet was firmly sealed.

The years immediately following the publication of “ Voices of the Night ” may be regarded as those of the greatest spontaneity in Mr. Longfellow’s poetic work. The title of the next volume of verse, “ Ballads and other Poems,” hints at the direction his mind was taking. “ I have broken ground in a new field,” he writes to Mr. Greene, January 2, 1840, “ namely, ballads ; beginning with the ‘ Wreck of the Schooner Hesperus,’ on the reef of Norman’s Woe, in the great storm of a fortnight ago. I shall send it to some newspaper. I think I shall write

more. The *national ballad* is a virgin soil here in New England ; and there are great materials. Besides, I have a great notion of working upon the *people's* feelings. I am going to have it printed on a sheet with a coarse picture on it. I desire a new sensation and a new set of critics. Nat. Hawthorne is tickled with the idea. Felton laughs and says, 'I would n't.' The familiar story of his invention of "Excelsior" is most suggestive of the poetic glow which his mind now experienced. "The Spanish Student" was another experiment in literary art struck out of his enthusiasm for Spanish literature, in which his work as a teacher had been engaging him. The volume of "Poems on Slavery" was the contribution which his patriotism under stress of indignation made to the rising tide of antislavery sentiment ; but though he never lessened in his strong hostility to slavery, he kept his expression for letters and conversation and public acts ; in his art he was commanded by less polemic influences.

The first publication of "The Spanish Student" was in 1842, during the author's absence in Europe. The "Poems on Slavery" were written on the return voyage. Mr. Longfellow was now thirty-five years old ; and as he turned back after his six months' vacation and faced homeward, he wrote the autobiographical sonnet, published after his death, entitled "Mezzo Cammin." In this he declares : —

"Half of my life is gone, and I have let
The years slip from me and have not fulfilled
The aspiration of my youth, to build
Some tower of song with lofty parapet.
Not indolence, nor pleasure, not the fret
Of restless passions that would not be stilled,
But sorrow, and a care that almost killed,
Kept me from what I may accomplish yet."

With the familiarity which Mr. Longfellow now had with great art and the consciousness he possessed of his own poetic power, he could scarcely have been content with brief swallow-flights of song. Conceptions of great works often lie unwrought for many years in the mind of the poet ; and Mr. Longfellow's habit of jotting down impulses and momentary resolutions in his note-book lets us partly into the secret of the *magnum opus* which dominated his life. The possibly vague aspiration of his youth "to build some tower of song with lofty parapet"

clearly took somewhat positive shape at this time. There is an entry in his journal, under date of November 8, 1841, which indicates how intensely and how comprehensively the conception of "Christus" possessed him at the outset:—

"This evening it has come into my mind to undertake a long and elaborate poem by the holy name of Christ; the theme of which would be the various aspects of Christendom in the Apostolic, Middle, and Modern Ages."

The summer following this decision was that which he spent at Marienberg, and coincidently with the writing of the sonnet "Mezzo Cammin" was the memorandum in his notebook:—

"Christus, a dramatic poem, in three parts.

Part First. The time of Christ. (Hope.)

Part Second. The Middle Ages. (Faith.)

Part Third. The Present. (Charity.)"

"The words in parenthesis," his biographer remarks, "are in pencil, and apparently added afterwards."

It was not till 1873 that the work as it now stands was published; and during those thirty-two years, which represent almost the whole of Mr. Longfellow's productive period, the subject of the trilogy seems never to have been long absent from his mind. The theme in its majesty was a flame by night and a pillar of cloud by day, which led his mind in all its onward movement; and he esteemed the work which he had undertaken as the really great work of his life. His religious nature was profoundly moved by it, and the degree of doubt which attended every step of his progress marked the height of the endeavor which he put forth. There was nothing violent or eccentric in this sudden resolution. The entry in his journal, his biographer states, is the only one for that year; but his correspondence and the dates of his poems indicate clearly enough that the course of his mental and spiritual life was flowing in a direction which made this resolve a most rational and at the same time inspiring expression of his personality. He had been singing those psalms of life, triumphant, sympathetic, aspiring, which showed how strong a hold the ethical principle had of him; he had been steeping his soul in Dante; he had been moved by the tender ecclesiasticism of "The Children of the Lord's Supper," and in

recording a passage in the life of Christ had fancied himself a monk of the Middle Ages; while the whole tenor of his life and thought had shown how strong a personal apprehension he had of the divine in humanity.

It was nine years from this resolution before he attacked the work in earnest, beginning then, as is well known, with the second part, and publishing it independently and without explanation of his full design, as "The Golden Legend"; but it is fair to suppose that the scheme itself in its entirety was one of those spiritual cinctures which bind the days of man, each to each. It is not at all improbable also that the exactions of his professional occupation had something to do with breaking the continuity of his poetical labor, and making him shrink from a task which called for great absorption of power. Certain it is that when in the winter of 1845-46 he was engaged upon his most sustained flight of verse up to this time, the poem of "Evangeline," his diary bears witness to the impatience of the distractions of his daily life incident to his position, which constantly withheld him from a task which gave him the greatest delight.

The three poems—"Evangeline," "The Song of Hiawatha," and "The Courtship of Miles Standish"—have superficially a more distinct place as expression of the larger sweep of Mr. Longfellow's poetical genius, but they bear no such relation to his more intimate life as the "Christus." They serve well to emphasize that ardent interest in American themes which was early illustrated by his eagerness to write of New England life, when he was in the flush of his enthusiasm for the art which Europe opened to his view. They illustrate also his technical skill and his instinctive sense of fitness of form. Regarding his period of poetical production as not far from sixty years, these three poems occupy, roughly speaking, the midway decade, and they are in the minds of most the central pieces about which the poet's shorter poems are grouped. Yet these shorter poems which have become most securely imbedded in the memories and affections of readers, these songs which he breathed into the air and found again in the heart of a friend, were freely sent forth with no long intervals up to the very end of his life. Perhaps the longest interval was during that withdrawal which followed the tragedy of his domestic life.

When he began to lift his head after the calamity which befell him in the death of his wife, "he felt the need," says his biographer, "of some continuous and tranquil occupation for his thoughts; and after some months he summoned the resolution to take up again the task of translating Dante." This was no new study with him; in one phase or another it had been a familiar pursuit since he made his first adventure in European literature, and his first collection of poems, "Voices of the Night," contained examples of translation from Dante; but now he pushed the work through to completion, and in the final publication in three volumes left on record a notable expression of an important phase of his intellectual endowment. As translation was one of the earliest signs of his appropriation of the art disclosed to him in foreign literature, after he had completed the tale of his greater works he resumed with distinct pleasure this form of communion with other poets. Indeed, throughout his life he recognized the gracious part which this exercise of translation played in the intellectual life. He found in such work a gentle stimulus to his poetic faculties, and resorted to it when wishing to quicken his spirit. "I agree with you entirely," he writes to Freiligrath, November 24, 1843, "in what you say about translations. It is like running a ploughshare through the soil of one's mind; a thousand germs of thought start up (excuse this agricultural figure), which otherwise might have lain and rotted in the ground. Still, it sometimes seems to me like an excuse for being lazy, — like leaning on another man's shoulder."

It is when one enlarges the conception of the word "translation" that one perceives how well it expresses a pervasive element of Mr. Longfellow's art. He was a consummate translator because the vision and faculty divine which he possessed was directed toward the reflection of the facts of nature and society rather than toward the facts themselves. He was like one who sees a landscape in a Claude Lorraine glass; by some subtle power of the mirror everything has been composed for him. Thus, when he came to use the rich material of history, of poetry, and of other arts, he saw these in forms already existing; and his art was not so much a reconstruction out of crude material as a representation, a rearrangement in his own exquisite language of what he found

and admired. He was first of all a composer, and he saw his subjects in their relations rather than in their essence. To tell over again old tales, to reproduce in forms of delicate fitness the scenes and narratives which others had invented, — this was his delight; for in doing this he was conscious of his power, and he worked with ease.

“The Divine Tragedy” was finished in 1870. It marks a characteristic of the poet that he must have always by him some comprehensive task; and on the day when he finished “Judas Maccabeus,” which was in a sense an offshoot of “The Divine Tragedy,” he recorded in his diary: “A new subject comes into my mind.” This was, no doubt, the subject of “Michael Angelo.” Two months later he wrote: “February 26, 1872. I have more definitely conceived the idea of a dramatic poem on Michael Angelo, which has been vaguely hovering in my thoughts for some time. Can I accomplish it?” In May he finished his first draft, but the poem never was completed. The author kept it by him, occasionally touching it, writing new scenes, rejecting portions, and seemingly reluctant to have it leave his desk. He wrote upon the first page, “A Fragment”; and a fragment it remains, even though it has the smoothness and apparent roundness of a finished work. It is possible, also, that in calling it a fragment Mr. Longfellow had in mind the fact that the time of the poem embraced but a small fraction of the artist’s life; and this consideration may have led him to throw aside the concluding scene of Michael Angelo’s death-bed as indicating too positive and final a close. It is certain that there is but slight attempt at the development of a drama, with its crises and denouement; the form adopted was that of a dramatic poem which permitted expansion and contraction within the natural limits of three major parts, and depended for its value in construction upon the skilful selection of scenes, chronological in their sequence, and yet indicative of the relations subsisting between the principal characters introduced.

There is an interest, however, attaching to this work which grows out of its place in Mr. Longfellow’s history. It was found in his desk and published after his death, ten years from the time when it was first composed, and bearing the marks of his occasional revision. When Michael Angelo

holds discourse from the vantage-ground of age with the volatile Benvenuto Cellini, his counsel to the younger man is mingled with pathetic reflections upon his own relation to art. He cannot leave Rome for Florence; he is under the spell which affects one like malaria, —

“Malaria of the mind
Out of this tomb of the majestic Past;
The fever to accomplish some great work
That will not let us sleep. I must go on
Until I die.”

So he speaks; and to Benvenuto's reminder of the memories which cluster about the pleasant city upon the Arno, he replies, musing: —

“Pleasantly
Come back to me the days when, as a youth,
I walked with Ghirlandajo in the gardens
Of Medici, and saw the antique statues,
The forms august of gods and godlike men,
And the great world of art revealed itself
To my young eyes. Then all that man hath done
Seemed possible to me. Alas! how little
Of all I dreamed of has my hand achieved!”

The caution against mistaking a poet's dramatic assumption for his own character and expression is of less force when applied to one in whom the dramatic power was but slightly developed; and the whole poem of “Michael Angelo,” taken in connection with the time and circumstances of its composition, may fairly be regarded as in some respects Longfellow's *apologia*. Michael Angelo rehearsing his art is dramatically conceived, and there is no lapse into the poet's own speech; for all that, and because of that, the reader is always aware of the presence of Longfellow, wise, calm, reflective, musing over the large thoughts of life and art. “I want it,” the poet says in his diary, “for a long and delightful occupation”; and he treated himself to the luxury of keeping the work by him, brooding over it, shaping it anew, adding, changing, discarding.

“Quickened are they that touch the Prophet's bones,” he says in his Dedication; and it may easily be believed that with no great scheme of verse haunting him, with no sense of incomplete plans, he would linger in the twilight of his poetic life

over the strong figure of the artist thus called up before him, and be kindled with a new poetic glow as he contemplated the great artist. For Michael Angelo in the poem is the virile character of the robust Italian seen in a softened, mellow light. We are not probably far astray when we say that Longfellow, in building this poem and reflecting upon its theme during the last ten years of his life, was more distinctly declaring his artistic creed than in any other of his works, and that the discussions which take place in the poem, more especially Michael Angelo's utterances on plastic or graphic art, had a peculiar interest for him as bearing upon analogous doctrines of the art of poetry.

The great sculptor is made to speak in his old age of —

“The fever to accomplish some great work
That will not let us sleep.”

If there was any such fever in Mr. Longfellow's case, — and possibly the writing of “Michael Angelo” is an evidence, — there certainly was from the beginning of his career a most healthy and normal activity of life, which stirred him to the achievement of great works in distinction from the familiar, frequent exercise of the poetic faculty.

“We have but one life here on earth,” he writes in his diary; “we must make that beautiful. And to do this health and elasticity of mind are needful; and whatever endangers or impedes these must be avoided.” This last entry lets a little light into the poet's temperament. That calm sweetness of spirit, which is so apparent in Longfellow, was an acquisition as well as an endowment. He deliberately chose and refrained according to a law in his members, and took clear cognizance of his nature and its tendencies. In a word, he was a sane man. There was a notable sanity about all his mode of life, and his attitude towards books and Nature and men. It was the positive which attracted him, the achievement in literature, the large, seasonable gifts of the outer world, the men and women themselves who were behind the deeds and words which made them known. The books which he read, as noted in his journals, were the generous books; he wanted the best wine of thought, and he avoided criticism. He basked in sunshine; he watched the sky, and was alive to the great sights and sounds, and to all the tender

influences of the seasons. In his intercourse with men, this sanity appeared in the power which he showed of preserving his own individuality in the midst of constant pressure from all sides ; he gave of himself freely to his intimate friends, but he dwelt, nevertheless, in a charmed circle, beyond the lines of which men could not penetrate. Praise did not make him arrogant or vain ; criticism, though it sometimes wounded him, did not turn him from his course. It is rare that one in our time has been the centre of so much admiration, and still rarer that one has preserved in the midst of it all that integrity of nature which never abdicates.